UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
31th meeting
held on
Thursday, 7 November 1991
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items (continued)

- Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-61712 7258V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.31
15 November 1991

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Germany who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27.

Mr. RITTER VON WAGNER (Germany): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time that I take the floor, I should like to extend my sincere congratulations upon your assumption of your very responsible and important task. You may rest assured that you have the full cooperation and support of the German delegation in this regard. We wish you luck and all success.

In 1989, the last time this Committee dealt with the subject of military budgets, there were still two draft resolutions on this item. One draft resolution was introduced by Romania with the title "Reduction of military budgets"; the other was introduced by my delegation and entitled "Military budgets".

We are happy to state today that this year the two delegations successfully undertook to develop a joint text, which you have in front of you as draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27. We are particularly proud of this result for two reasons: firstly, we regard the merger of the two draft resolutions as a contribution to the rationalization of work in the Committee. Whenever there are draft resolutions of a similar content on our agenda every effort should be made to come to a joint text. Only significant, substantial and insurmountable differences of opinion on the respective subjects can, in our view, justify parallel draft resolutions.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Secondly, we are proud of the merger because it represents one of the many small, seemingly insignificant steps, that now clearly show that Europe has overcome political separation and confrontation.

The major idea in one of the former draft resolutions, to reduce defence budgets in order to promote disarmament, has proved to be too simplistic. Progress in arms control and disarmament is always the result of a wider political process and military budgets would only follow and then reflect such a development. That is being proved in Europe today where defence budgets are in the process of adaptation to a new political climate.

If this European development, however, had been the sole background for our draft resolution, we would have refrained from putting forward a new draft resolution on the issue. However, having listened carefully to the statements during the general debate of this Committee, we have been delighted to learn that the concept of confidence-building measures has found almost world-wide support.

For example, the representative from Kenya said during the general debate:

"The concept of confidence building is to create mutual trust and favourable conditions to enhance world disarmament, peace and security. The enhancement and application of confidence-building measures on the subregional level is, therefore, an integral part of our global disarmament endeavour." (A/C.1/46/PV.15, p. 33)

The representative from Sri Lanka stated:

"We have to take urgent steps to intensify our efforts by strengthening confidence-building activities so as to prevent misunderstanding and miscalculations that might lead to irreversible military confrontation. ... If information on military capabilities and predictability and

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

openness in military affairs are available, that will provide the opportunity to reduce military confrontation, thereby achieving a realistic reduction in military budgets." (A/C.1/46/PV.6, p. 9)

Openness, transparency and confidence-building measures clearly have gained global significance.

It is the primary goal of the joint Romanian-German draft resolution to promote this process of carrying the issue of confidence-building measures even further, focusing upon two areas. Since General Assembly resolution 35/142 B of 12 December 1980 the United Nations has introduced a standardized reporting system on military expenditures. About one third of all States represented here are taking part in it.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Thus, one purpose of this draft resolution is to commend those States that are already reporting their military expenditures and to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for providing the reports on this issue. Above all, however, we would like to encourage all States that have up to now refrained from reporting military expenditures to the Secretary-General to report them in the future. We believe that, in view of the end of the East-West confrontation and the easing of tensions in many regions as a result of this development, it is time for those States not yet participating in the reporting system to reconsider their position.

Openness and transparency in military matters should be striven for not only in the field of military expenditures but in other areas of military relevance as well. Working Group I of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is dealing with this issue in a wider context. Much useful work has already been accomplished, but to finalize the deliberations of Working Group I in 1992 as foreseen will still require major efforts by all States. Therefore, we would like to ask all States participating in the Disarmament Commission to support it actively in its endeavours to complete its work on the issue of objective information on military matters in 1992.

Finally, I would like to thank the Romanian delegation for its excellent cooperation in this matter, and all the sponsors of this resolution for their support. Furthermore, I should like to ask all other States present at this Committee meeting to vote in favour of this draft resolution, which supports two important activities in the field of confidence-building in military matters.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): As I am taking the floor for the first time in this Committee, it is my great pleasure to join other speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your election to preside over our deliberations. My congratulations also go to the other officers of the Bureau.

From the outset, I would like to stress that my delegation fully shares the considerations just presented by our German colleague, Ambassador Ritter von Wagner, while he introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27 on transparency of military expenditures. I would also like in turn to thank the German delegation and the other sponsors for their understanding in the process of elaborating and promoting this proposal.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27 reflects the developments that have occurred in the world and at the United Nations in the last few years. With respect to the United Nations, I have in mind, among other things, the concern for a more realistic and constructive approach to the problems under discussion, on the one hand, and for a reduction of the number of resolutions, on the other. The draft resolution covers both sub-item (a) and sub-item (b) of agenda item 47.

A consensus is emerging among the countries of the world that increased transparency in the military field can significantly contribute to strengthening international security and stability. As my delegation had occasion to underline during the Committee's general debate, a wider participation in the annual reporting of military expenditures offers elements for strengthening mutual confidence.

In the meantime, transparency paves the way for adopting effective measures to reduce military activities, armaments, troops and budgets. In this respect, the experience of the European States within the framework of

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) deserves to be mentioned. One could hardly conceive of the possibility of concluding the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe without the effort that went into many years of preparatory work to draft and implement various confidence-building measures, beginning with those provided in the Helsinki Final Act itself.

Last year in Vienna, another decision was adopted providing for, inter alia, the annual exchange of information among CSCE countries on their military budgets on the basis of the categories of the United Nations standardized reporting system on military expenditures. Thus, measures taken at the regional level intertwine with the efforts made in the framework of the United Nations at the world level. We hope that this approach, and the draft resolution itself, will meet with the general support of the participating delegations, so that the draft resolution can be adopted by consensus.

Mr. RITTER VON WAGNER (Germany): I will now speak on agenda item 59, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". I would like to express the German Government's support for the three draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.36, A/C.1/46/L.16, and A/C.1/46/L.9, which have all been co-sponsored by Germany.

In particular, I would like to focus on the subject-matter of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36, which addresses the negotiations of the Conference on Disarmament on a global ban on chemical weapons. The Geneva negotiations on a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

destruction have been going on for a number of years. For a number of years, too, this Committee has regularly adopted resolutions calling on the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its work. In this respect, this year's draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36 is not new. However, its significance for the global dialogue on arms control and disarmament has dramatically increased.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Having had the opportunity to listen in this room yesterday to the report of Ambassador Batsanov, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, we know that negotiations in Geneva have reached a watershed. The final breakthrough is in sight and draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36 therefore states that the General Assembly:

"Strongly urges the Conference on Disarmament, as a matter of the highest priority, to resolve in the forthcoming months outstanding issues so as to achieve a final agreement during its 1992 session".

If the Conference on Disarmament failed to live up to this task, the consequences for the dialogue on global arms control might be grave, as the positive ramifications of success would go far beyond chemical disarmament.

Let me elaborate on the crucial importance of a convention banning chemical weapons, on the need for it, and on the opportunities it offers.

Chemical weapons are not only a particularly cruel and repugnant means of warfare; their military value is very dubious at best and their continued legitimate existence poses a grave threat to international peace and security. The Gulf War and its antecedents have confirmed three conclusions: First, chemical weapons may be suitable for terrorizing unprotected civilians: they are apparently not suitable for deciding the outcome of a modern war, nor do they provide a useful deterrent to the outbreak of such a war. Secondly, despite their limited military utility, chemical weapons do have very harmful political properties: in the hands of unscrupulous aggressors they can foster political and military adventurism. Thirdly, non-proliferation efforts are insufficient to control the dangers that chemical weapons constitute for the international community.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Looking at the lessons of the Gulf War, one might wonder why it seems so difficult to bring the Geneva negotiations to a close. The security benefits which a global ban on chemical weapons would bring about seem so obvious that it is hard to understand any hesitation. Such security benefits would accrue to all countries, although some might have a particular interest in the chemical weapons convention. A Chinese scholar of the Research Institute of Chemical Defence in Beijing recently observed:

"... Developing countries face a more dangerous threat from chemical weapons than do developed countries. It is not surprising that all the uses of chemical weapons after the First World War were against developing countries.

"... the statement 'Chemical weapons are the poor man's nuclear bomb' is wrong. The right statement is 'Chemical weapons are the sword of Damocles hanging over the poor man's head.'"

The immediate security benefits which would flow from a global ban on chemical weapons already provide a compelling reason for strongly urging the Conference on Disarmament to conclude negotiations in Geneva. But there are further compelling reasons - reasons going beyond chemical weapons.

It may well be that the future of multilateral arms control and disarmament is at stake. It is very difficult to maintain the momentum of a complex, long-term endeavour such as multilateral arms control without any visible, tangible results. Success in this field requires treaties. The Conference on Disarmament in its present form has not produced a single text for an international treaty. The environmental modification Convention of 18 May 1977 is the latest achievement of global arms control to date.

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

Whereas disarmament treaties between the former cold war opponents proliferate, arms control on a global scale seems to have come to a standstill.

This somewhat gloomy picture would change dramatically if the Conference on Disarmament finally came to terms with the few remaining issues of the chemical weapons convention. The convention would provide invaluable fresh impetus for the endeavour of global arms control. The liberation of mankind from the threat of chemical weapons would have positive implications that would go far beyond the matter under negotiation.

In addition to the direct security benefits, States parties to the convention would discover a completely new experience in applying an unprecedented body of provisions for global disarmament and verification. Experience in applying the instruments of the convention would help people to understand that reliable disarmament does not imply risk, but rather opportunity; not a danger for national sovereignty, but a singular opportunity to build on the foundations of a new, cooperative concept of international security.

Looking at the problems that remain to be negotiated for the chemical weapons convention in this broader context, their relative significance, having been put into perspective, should have become clearer. The remaining obstacles, although reflecting serious questions such as verification, must be surmountable. Having a vision of the larger issues at stake, we will overcome them.

The success of the chemical weapons convention will depend largely on its universal acceptance. In this respect, the general debate in this Committee has been very encouraging. Most delegations have clearly pronounced their strong support and interest in the success of the Geneva negotiations. The

(Mr. Ritter von Wagner, Germany)

attractiveness of the convention will also play a key role with regard to universality. But more will be needed, in particular demonstrations of responsibility on the regional level. In some regions, long-standing political conflicts might seem to require prior solution before accession to the chemical weapons convention is considered. However, there could be a fallacy in such thinking: recent history has shown us that arms control treaties are not only luxury items that follow peace; they are vital instruments in bringing about and strengthening peace.

The time has come for a global ban on chemical weapons. After long periods of contentious debate and stagnation, we are facing a singular opportunity. Let us grasp it so that, one year from now, the First Committee may adopt by consensus the text of a chemical weapons convention.

Mr. STANKOV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation would like to offer some brief comments on agenda item 60 (d), "Conversion of military resources to civilian purposes", which is included in this session's agenda in compliance with resolution 44/116 J. We should like to note, with due appreciation, the report of the Secretary-General, which reflects the views of a number of Member States on various aspects of this complex issue.

We highly appreciate also the work carried out in recent years by the United Nations Secretariat, notably by the Department for Disarmament Affairs, in assisting the efforts of Member States in seeking the best ways to make use, on a mutual basis, of their experience in conversion for the needs of economic development.

Bulgaria is among the countries striving to react adequately to the radical changes in the security domain on both the European and the global plane by, inter alia, taking serious steps for the practical implementation of this kind of conversion. Probably, one of the major features of Bulgaria's national programme for the conversion of military industries is the fact that it is paralleled by a transition from a centrally planned towards a free-market economy which is being carried out in conditions of grave economic crisis.

In fulfilling this programme, we have already accumulated some experience. Between 1988 and 1991, Bulgaria converted effectively 40 per cent of its military production capacity, while the civilian output of military industries increased by a factor of four and a half. During the present year alone, military-industrial plants launched over 100 new products for civilian use. Implementing these and other similar measures is made more difficult by the need to take into acccunt the technological specificities and capabilities

(Mr. Stankov, Bulgaria)

of the existing military-industrial plants, and to sustain a high level of cost efficiency while converting them to civilian uses.

Bulgaria needs substantial assistance in this field, and, for that purpose, has established business contacts with companies in Germany, Austria, the United States, Japan and Greece for joint research and development, manufacture and marketing of conversion-related products, inter alia, by investment in new production and by setting up joint ventures.

At the same time, we try to be realistic by pursuing a truly pragmatic approach in this field. Thus, the views exchanged so far within the United Nations on the role of the Organization in addressing the conversion issue, combined with the experience that Bulgaria already has in this area, prompt us to conclude that at this stage there are no serious grounds for expecting it to be possible to adopt a uniform and universal approach towards conversion which would produce optimum results in all circumstances and for every country involved.

We are now becoming increasingly aware that, especially in matters of conversion, the chief motivating factors for any State's policy are of an economic rather than a political nature. The obvious obstacles to the adoption of a common code of conversion-related behaviour acceptable to and binding on all States, particularly in such a broadly representative forum as the United Nations, prompt us to believe that the most appropriate way for each country to address the issue of military conversion would be by adopting individually-tailored, well-balanced and generally pragmatic approaches fully attuned to countries' specific conditions.

(Mr. Stankov, Bulgaria)

Naturally, in doing this we should not ignore possibilities for a multilateral exchange of views and experience on matters of military conversion, inter alia, within the framework and with the assistance of the United Nations and other relevant multilateral forums.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Yugoslavia, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21.

Mr. ZUGIC (Yugoslavia): I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21, entitled "Report to the Conference on Disarmament", on behalf of the group of sponsors, consisting of Algeria, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution before us testifies to the importance we attach to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We are convinced that in the present international climate, when substantive progress is being made in bilateral and regional areas, the Conference has acquired even greater importance as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body. At the same time, in a situation where the bilateral negotiations are gaining momentum, we feel obliged to stress once again that multilateral efforts and bilateral negotiations should complement each other.

The particular emphasis in the draft we propose concerns the breakthroughs achieved in the negotiations on the elaboration of a draft of a comprehensive, global convention on chemical weapons. Therefore we welcome these positive developments and urge the Conference to intensify its work with a view to completing negotiations in 1992.

(Mr. Zugic, Yugoslavia)

We are convinced that the Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, should be the organ most directly involved in negotiating all the priority issues in disarmament, and particularly those concerning nuclear disarmament. However, we regret that this year again this has not been realized. As a result, the sponsors of the draft resolution are sorry that the Conference was not able to commence negotiations on the nuclear issues on its agenda.

As was the case last year, special attention is paid to the efforts made to improve the functioning of the Conference which, in our view, would contribute to the efficiency of its work. At the same time, we propose that the General Assembly should call upon the Conference to strengthen its work, further its mandate in respect of substantive negotiations, and adopt concrete measures on the specific priority issues of disarmament on its agenda; and should urge the Conference to provide negotiating mandates to ad hoc committees on all agenda items.

Before concluding, I should like to express our appreciation to all the delegations I mentioned for their constructive cooperation as joint sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21, and to the other delegations which offered their views. At the same time, my delegation, together with the other sponsors, expresses its readiness to pursue further negotiations with all interested delegations in the hope that the draft resolution, once put to the vote, will receive the widest support.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of India, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.19 and A/C.1/46/L.20.

Mr. SHAH (India): Over the last couple of weeks we have heard many statements welcoming the many positive changes that have occurred in the politico-military and security situation in the world. The dramatically changed scenario in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern Europe, the end of cold war and East-West confrontation and its impact on prospects for peace and disarmament, the unilateral announcements of decisions to dismantle and destroy some portions of the awesome nuclear arsenals of some nuclear-weapon countries, and the improved political climate for further cuts, are all indeed very positive changes.

(Mr. Shah, India)

We believe it is a welcome, though belated, change in the approach to nuclear disarmament. We listen carefully when the non-nuclear weapon countries are asked to respond to these changes in their approach to disarmament, but we also believe that welcome as these changes are, they must not blind us to the other reality. And that relates to changes that have not taken place.

There is no change in the thinking that nuclear weapons are necessary for security. The existing nuclear arasenals can still destroy the world several times over. Despite the end of East-West confrontation, there is no change in approach as regards the doctrine of deterrence. There is no change in the policy of reserving the right to conduct nuclear explosions for armaments purposes. The production of nuclear weapons, the qualitative enhancement of nuclear weaponry through scientific and technological improvements, the production of fissionable materials, the manufacture of delivery systems for nuclear weapons, and nuclear weapon testing still continue. And there is no change in the policies that do no want to renounce the right to use nuclear weapons or to threaten to use them, despite the welcome assertion that a nuclear war must not be fought and cannot be won, and despite the innumerable expert opinions about the "nuclear winter" and end of all kinds of living organism if nuclear weapons are used either by design or by accident.

The overwhelming majority of humanity wants a nuclear-weapon-free world. They want complete nuclear disarmament. They want the elimination of all nuclear weapons from this Earth and from outer space. These are our goals and objectives. And they must remain humanity's immutable objectives, which should not be changed or diluted regardless of improvements in the international climate, which we welcome.

(Mr. Shah, India)

My delegation believes that these are achievable objectives despite the difference of perceptions on their realization. My delegation is optimistic that just as the international community is now negotiating a total ban on the use of chemical and toxic weapons in addition to a ban on their production and stockpiling, we will one day negotiate a convention on banning the use of nuclear weapons, on the cessation of all nuclear-weapons tests, on production of nuclear weapons and on their complete elimination. But we believe that it is necessary to reiterate these goals and to pursue proposals to achieve them. These proposals do not become irrelevant or unnecessary, as some might think, just because the political climate has changed. In fact, the changed political climate is conducive to implementation of the ideas contained in the draft resolutions we are presenting.

It is in this spirit that my delegation wishes to introduce two draft resolutions. The first of these is draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, on a nuclear-arms freeze, which is sponsored by Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar and Sudan as well as by India, representing the three most populous non-nuclear regions of the world. The thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19 is the same as in previous years. It calls upon all nuclear-weapon States to agree to a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze, which would go far beyond the unilateral cuts in some categories of weapons announced by two nuclear-weapon Powers. The comprehensive freeze will embrace a comprehensive nuclear-weapons-test ban, complete cessation of manufacturing of all nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, and complete cessation of the production of fissionable material, among other things.

The second is draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20, on a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. This draft resolution is

(Mr. Shah, India)

sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia as well as by India. The draft resolution reiterates the conviction that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons remains the goal and it calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations in order to reach agreement on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

My delegation is privileged to introduce the two draft resolutions on behalf of all the sponsors, to whom we extend our thanks. We urge all Member States to contribute positively to the changed international climate by supporting these resolutions, and subsequently to take action to implement them.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze", which has just been introduced by the representative of India. The objectives of the draft resolution have frequently been misunderstood. As is stated in the preamble, a nuclear-weapons freeze is not an end in itself but rather an effective step towards preventing the qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry. Such a measure is much more effective when it takes place during periods of negotiation as it helps build confidence between States.

Thus, we are not trying to freeze nuclear arsenals at their present levels in terms of numbers but rather to prevent them from continuing to increase in destructive power, which does not mean they should not be reduced in number. Failure to stop the upgrading of armaments would make nonsense of any limitation measure. What would be the point of scrapping certain types

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

of weapons and removing them from a region if the region continued to be threatened by more powerful weapons, possibly even controlled from space.

With the new international climate and the announcement of significant unilateral disarmament measures on the part of the nuclear-arms Powers, there can hardly be a better time to propose a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze as proposed in the draft resolution. We wonder why new nuclear weapons and fissionable materials continue to be produced when it has not yet been decided what to do with existing arms. We urgently appeal to the nuclear-weapon States to reach an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze, which would embrace first, a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons and on their delivery systems; secondly, the complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles; thirdly, a ban on all further deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, and finally the complete cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.

As can be seen, our aim is to close the door to the production of nuclear-weapons systems. Only in this way would there be any sense in the measures proposed for the reduction of nuclear arsenals. It would be absurd to reduce some nuclear weapons while continuing to produce others.

Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt): It is an honour for the delegation of Egypt to be presenting draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, on behalf of its sponsors: Argentina, Brazil, China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Jordan, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and my own country. I would also like to state that the delegation of India has conveyed its decision to sponsor this text.

(Mr. Shoukry, Egypt)

The rapid developments that are continuing to unfold in the field of space science and technology have kindled the imagination of mankind as to the vast prospects that may lie ahead. The tangible benefits that the peaceful use of outer space has already provided have consolidated the overwhelming desire of the vast majority of the international community that no effort be spared in trying to maintain this vast domain as an exclusive area of international cooperation, to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic and scientific development.

(Mr. Shoukry, Egypt)

The current welcome developments in international relations that herald the prospects of a new era of international cooperation, peace and security and constructive efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control cannot but have a dramatic impact on our common efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space. Since the one complements the other, the delegations sponsoring the draft resolution are convinced that both bilateral and multilateral efforts in this regard must continue and make effective progress if we are to achieve our objectives. We are committed to contributing to the prevention of an arms race in outer space with all the resources at our disposal, especially within the appropriate international forums. This is a necessary element to strengthen international peace and security and to eliminate the dangers posed by any escalation in the arms race, through practical and concrete measures that can be taken to implement decisions to prevent the militarization of outer space.

We also note the outcome of the work on this topic done by the Ad Hoc Committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space during this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament, and we hope that during the 1992 session the Ad Hoc Committee will make further progress in examining and identifying the issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, now before the First Committee, follows closely the lines of last year's resolution, which was a compromise resolution. There are some minor changes - in many instances of either a technical or an editorial nature, and in other instances aimed at achieving more clarity while maintaining the essential substance which commanded wide-range support last year.

(Mr. Shoukry, Egypt)

Following what has now become a custom, the delegations of Egypt, Sri Lanka and Venezuela collaborated this year in conducting consultations with the various groups in an effort to accommodate the various suggestions made concerning this draft resolution, I might add that there was a limited number of suggestions this year because of the substantial achievement in formulating last year's resolution - an achievement that must be credited to Ambassador Rasaputram of Sri Lanka.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25 will receive the same overwhelming support that the draft resolution on this item received last year.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Egypt has just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

In our opinion, this draft resolution is a major contribution to the activities just carried out by the Conference on Disarmament, because the Ad Hoc Committee established by the Conference six years ago has been working towards identifying areas of convergence. Since my delegation chaired that Committee at the 1991 session, I wish to emphasize certain parts of the report of the Conference on Disarmament that make it clear that the Ad Hoc Committee worked hard to find common ground in a field where this has not always been easy.

The report points out that this year the Ad Hoc Committee adopted a more dynamic and practical methodology, enabling it to give more detailed consideration to the items before it. The Chairman prepared a series of lists of topics with a view to structuring the discussion in an orderly way, focusing on the questions of greatest interest to delegations and leaving

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

aside those that seemed to be of less interest. These lists are annexed to the report (A/46/27, para. 91) of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament and can serve as a guide for future deliberation.

For the first time since its establishment in 1985 the Ad Hoc Committee had the assistance of "Friends of the Chairman" in dealing, respectively, with three specific topics: terminological aspects related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space; issues related to verification of anti-satellite weapons; and confidence-building measures, including improvement of existing and future databases relating to space activities.

The prevention of an arms race in outer space is of fundamental importance for the security of all States, whether or not they are space Powers. The Conference on Disarmament has reflected this interest and, in accordance with the Ad Hoc Committee's programme of work, has been seeking to identify areas of convergence.

In this respect, we trust that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, which was negotiated by the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka, will give new impetus to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. That is why we fully support it.

Mr. SALAZAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Venezuela is particularly interested in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, introduced by the representative of Egypt.

While reaffirming the importance and urgency preventing an arms race in outer space, the Assembly, under this draft resolution, would recognize, inter alia, that the legal regime applicable to outer space by itself does not guarantee the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Mr. Salazar, Venezuela)

The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, is in force. We have all acknowledged that it plays a significant role in governing activities pertaining to outer space. However, when this Treaty was negotiated and entered into force we did not foresee the possibility of the development of strategic weapons and defence systems that could operate in outer space, from outer space and towards outer space. That is why we have reaffirmed that the legal regime applicable to outer space cannot by itself prevent an arms race there.

It is well known that the Conference on Disarmament plays the primary role in the negotiation of various multilateral agreements, as appropriate, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects. For some years now, the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference has been doing useful work in identifying and assessing various aspects of this complicated subject. It has before it many proposals designed to improve the current legal regime. The Ad Hoc Committee's work this year was particularly valuable since its deliberations, under the wise guidance of Ambassador Garcia Moritan of Argentina, took place in a more orderly and systematic way.

In our opinion, the Conference should prepare new legal instruments to deal in a comprehensive, multilateral manner with the question of the non-militarization of outer space.

(Mr. Salazar, Venezuela)

It is thus necessary to focus on identifying and crafting specific measures, taking advantage of existing areas of common ground and proposals. The present international climate should contribute to the attainment of these important objectives, and we urge the United States and the Soviet Union to press forward intensively with their bilateral negotiations in a constructive spirit in order to prevent outer space from becoming a new arena for the arms race.

We are convinced that by including fundamental, unquestionably important elements, draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25 constitutes a step in the right direction and we hope it will enjoy the fullest support.

We also take this opportunity to express our pleasure at the statement made yesterday by the representative of France in which he announced that his Government was giving positive consideration to possible ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean. We hope that possibility will soon become reality, marking the end of a significant phase in the history of the Additional Protocols to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. This would make an important contribution to regional and international security.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): I would like to make some comments on the issues dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 on a comprehensive test-ban treaty and in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 on bilateral nuclear negotiations, as some important indications can be drawn from the most recent developments in the context of nuclear disarmament.

Last July, we all welcomed the positive conclusion of the first round of the negotiations on a strategic arms reduction treaty (START) as a substantive

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

result in the process of the reduction of nuclear arsenals. I do not think that the announcement subsequently made by President Bush on 23 September 1991, followed by that of President Gorbachev, could possibly have been envisaged at that time. Those announcements challenge our very ability to adapt our assessments to such a rapidly evolving political and strategic environment.

Both an optimistic and a pessimistic interpretation of these developments can be made. We could in fact consider with dismay the existing gaps between the announced nuclear reductions and the size of nuclear arsenals still present in the world, and draw the conclusion that in reality nothing has changed. On the other hand, we could compare the quick pace at which new opportunities are being created to the lagging mood which had pervaded disarmament negotiations in the past, and make the assessment that realism appears to be more on the side of those who incline towards optimism.

The North Atlantic Alliance, although reaffirming the necessity of continuing to rely in the present circumstances on nuclear deterrence, has decided to adapt its strategic policies, including their nuclear component, to the profoundly modified needs of European security.

In that context, I wish to recall that Defence Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), gathered in Taormina on 18 October, underlined that, as far as Europe is concerned, there is no longer any requirement for nuclear ground-launched short-range ballistic missiles and artillery. At the same time, they announced a total reduction of 80 per cent of the sub-strategic weapons currently present in Europe. The entire set of proposals for a drastically reduced and restructured NATO nuclear posture

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

reflects the dramatic changes in the speed of transformation: as the security situation evolves, nuclear policy and posture will continue to be reviewed.

The NATO summit being held today in Rome has just adopted a new strategic concept for the Alliance, which further reduces the reliance on its nuclear component. Other encouraging signs can be noted in the multilateral context, such as the declarations by China and France on their intention to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as the recent accession to that Treaty of South Africa, Zambia and Tanzania. It is Italy's hope that in 1995 the NPT will become a permanent and universal pillar of international security and stability.

The question of nuclear testing remains a controversial problem indeed: nevertheless, encouraging signs can be noted even on this matter, such as for instance the drastic reduction of approximately 60 per cent in the number of nuclear explosions which, according to reliable sources, has occurred in the last five years.

At the same time, it is now generally acknowledged that the thresholds set by the partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty and the threshold nuclear-test-ban Treaty no longer reflect today's needs and realities in nuclear testing. As a consequence, the question of the verifiability of underground explosions is acquiring an increasing importance. In that respect, we hope that the future proceedings of the Conference on Disarmament, with the participation of the Ad Hoc Group of seismological experts, will tackle such problems by means of updated guidelines.

The widespread hope for a dramatic reduction of all nuclear arsenals in the world seems no longer to be at odds with our analysis of what could be considered today as a realistic goal to be pursued.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

At the same time, concerns regarding the danger of proliferation still dwell in our minds, while new issues emerge, such as the crucial question of nuclear-arms control in the Soviet Union and the technical and financial problems relating to the destruction of nuclear weapons, especially when disarmament measures shift from strategic delivery systems to tactical nuclear munitions.

Also, the technical implications of ideas concerning the utilization and control of fissionable materials made available as a result of the reduction of nuclear arsenals deserve, in our view, in-depth analysis.

As stated today in Rome by Prime Minister Andreotti, a further huge effort towards new disarmament achievements is necessary, and should include nuclear disarmament as a priority. The possibility of achieving an international security system less characterized by nuclear armaments seems to be within reach. The moment has come to strive for a less confrontational debate on nuclear disarmament, through a more constructive and factual approach.

On the basis of that positive evaluation of what has been achieved thus far and of the prospects before us, Italy intends to support draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.4 and A/C.1/46/L.37. Although not necessarily endorsing all their implications, we are convinced that the time is ripe for trying to focus our attention much more on what we commonly assess as positive developments and prospects, rather than on remaining differences.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): Mr. Chairman, in a statement made earlier this week I made some remarks of a complimentary nature directed to you and to your remarkable country. Secure in the faith that they were conveyed to you, I forbear from repeating them this afternoon.

I am speaking as one of the sponsors in support of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13, "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The draft resolution was introduced yesterday by the representative of Sweden.

The Convention, as has been remarked, is an indication of the commitment of the international community to develop international humanitarian law in the field of conventional weaponry.

It is, obviously, of major importance that more States adhere to the Convention so that it can become genuinely universal. In that context I should like to recall my delegation's well-known position, namely, that we maintain the suggestion of establishing a consultative committee of experts to investigate alleged violations of the Protocols to the Convention. We believe that such a consultative committee would help to increase the trust and confidence of States in the implementation of the Convention and could, accordingly, help to strengthen it and to promote universal adherence to it. We note the possibility provided for in article 8 of the Convention for renewing the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols and for setting further international standards relating to other categories of conventional weapons not already covered.

The representative of Sweden has identified a number of categories of weapons that might be made subject to further specific restructions. My delegation would like in particular to draw attention to Sweden's comments on

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

laser technology. My delegation would like to support the suggestion that consideration be given to how to deal with the laser weapons referred to by the representative of Sweden.

Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): I wish to make a brief statement in connection with agenda item 50 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weaspons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

The delegation of Brazil listened with great interest to the statement made yesterday afternoon in the Committee by the representative of France, in which he announced that:

"France is positively studying the possibility of ratifying Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco." (A/C.1/46/PV.29, p. 18

Brazil takes note with satisfaction of this announcement by the French Government.

When Brazil ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco in 1968 it did not choose to waive the requirements laid down in the Treaty for its entry into force. Among these requirements, which are spelt out in article 28, paragraph 1, is the ratificiation of Additional Protocol I by all of the four States that are internationally responsible for territories situated in the zone of application of the Treaty.

Last November the Presidents of Brazil and Argentina signed at Foz do Iguaçu a Joint Declaration (A/45/809) in which they announced their decision to adopt the Joint Accounting and Control System, applied to all the nuclear activities of the two countries, and to negotiate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) a joint safeguards agreement based on this System. They also announced their decision that, after the conclusion

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

of the safeguards agreement with the IAEA, they would take appropriate action to permit the full entry into force for the two countries of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, including action to update and improve its wording.

The announcement made yesterday by the French delegation is, in our opinion, a very positive step in the process of creating conditions for the full entry into force of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

Before concluding, I should like to reserve the right of my delegation to examine and, if necessary, to comment on the draft decision concerning the possible inclusion of a new item on the agenda of the next session of the General Assembly, which was announced in the statement made yesterday in the Committee by the representative of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the United States, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.26.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): Today, the United States delegation is introducing a draft resolution under agenda item 48, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements," document A/C.1/46/L.26, dated 1 November 1991.

The draft resolution is very similar to the resolucion adopted by the General Assembly in 1989 as resolution 44/122. In the current draft there is a new operative paragraph that welcomes the role that the United Nations has played in restoring the integrity of certain arms limitation and disarmament agreements and in the removal of threats to peace. The new paragraph has been added to take into account the crucial role the United Nations has played this year, by decision of the Security Council, in seeking to address non-compliance concerns. A few other changes have been introduced into the text to enhance and update the resolution.

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

During the past two years we have seen develop in the First Committee a much-improved atmosphere and a broad recognition of the vital importance compliance plays in the arms control and disarmament process. Resolutions similar to the one we are introducing today have been adopted by consensus at the forty-first, forty-second, forty-third and forty-fourth session of the General Assembly. This year the improved atmosphere is further demonstrated by the long list of the sponsors of draft resolution L.26, a list that transcends geopolitical boundaires and includes Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and Zaire.

The United States is gratified that compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements is now firmly established as a matter of concern to the community of nations. It is important for each party to ensure that it is in compliance, but it is equally important to remove any doubts that others may have regarding a party's compliance. Confidence in existing agreements is a significant part of the foundation for future agreements. Non-compliance, on the other hand, cannot but have an adverse effect on the prospects for future agreements and on efforts to enhance international peace and security. Compliance with existing agreements is essential, therefore, to the fundamental objectives and purposes of the United Nations.

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

The United States believes that the adoption of this draft resolution, again by consensus, would constitute a strong reaffirmation by the world community of the crucial importance of compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements. We are grateful to the numerous sponsors of this draft resolution, and we invite all members of the Committee to give it their full support.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/46/L.14, Democratic People's Republic of Korea; A/C.1/46/L.33, Hungary.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind members that, in accordance with the programme of work, the Committee will proceed to take action on the first cluster of draft resolutions tomorrow morning, Friday, 8 November 1991.

The Committee will then proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2. In following this procedure, we shall nevertheless maintain a desirable degree of flexibility.

It is my intention to move, in so far as possible, from one cluster to another sequentially upon the conclusion of action on each cluster.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Friday, 8 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items

- Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.32
18 November 1991

ENGLISH

91-61724 7279V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Kheradi.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/46/L.36: Luxembourg;

A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1: Uruguay;

A/C.1/46/L.26: Republic of Korea and Senegal;

A/C.1/46/L.9, L.23, L.25, L.28 and L.43: India.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the programme of work and timetable, this morning the Committee will begin taking action on draft resolutions under disarmament agenda items which appear in cluster 1. Those draft resolutions are listed in the informal paper which was distributed to members of the Committee on Tuesday, 5 November. As representatives were informed at our previous meeting, under cluster 1 today we shall take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.1, L.3, L.5, L.8, L.10, L.13, L.26, L.33 and L.39.

Before proceeding to the stage of taking decisions on draft resolutions I should like once again to remind members of the Committee of the following procedure which will be observed during this stage of the Committee's work. As regards action on each individual cluster, delegations will first have the opportunity to introduce draft resolutions in that cluster. Delegations will then have the opportunity to make any statement other than in explanation of their positions or votes which they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions in the cluster.

(The Chairman)

Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken would do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the decision is taken would do so.

In connection with the procedures to which I have just referred, I wish to appeal to delegations to make a consolidated statement on draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, with respect to the statements and explanations of vote concerned. I am confident that I will have the Committee's cooperation in this matter since, in effect, such an approach will be conducive to greater rationalization of our work.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call on the representative of Nigeria, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): It is an honour for me to introduce, on behalf of the other sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship training and advisory services".

The world is at a historic turning-point. Times are changing, giving rise to more hope perhaps than at any time in recent memory. Through the opportunities offered to an appreciable number of public officials by the United Nations disarmament fellowship and advisory services, a great deal of useful experience has been gained over the years. Indeed, some of the representatives participating in the work of this Committee today have benefited in the past from the fellowship programme. They certainly possess a

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

much clearer sense of expertise on the complex and complicated issues of disarmament, which enables them to respond effectively to our deliberations.

The draft resolution before the Committee is essentially the same as the one adopted last year. In the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution the Assembly would note with satisfaction that the programme has trained a number of public officials. In addition, it would note that many officials of developing countries had acquired expertise through the training programme.

The Assembly would also express its appreciation to Member States which had rendered financial assistance to the workshops conducted under the programme. The support of all Member States is required to enable the training programme to continue to achieve its primary objective of providing expertise to developing countries in the field of disarmament.

It is the hope of the sponsors that the draft resolution will, as in previous years, be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: As no delegations wish to make statements other than in explanation of their positions on draft resolutions in cluster 1, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position before a decision is taken on all draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. BRECKON (United States of America): The United States wishes to announce that we will not participate in whatever action the First Committee takes on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8 in cluster 1. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked. Consequently, the United States did not participate in the 1987 International Conference on this matter.

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

The United States delegation requests that the record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in consideration of, or action on, draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8, on disarmament and development.

At the same time, our delegation takes this opportunity to state again that the United States Government does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the International Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of the United States will appear in the record.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Before the First Committee takes action on the draft decision in document A/C.1/46/L.39, the delegation of Mexico would like to state its understanding about the procedure to be followed in the preparatory process for the 1995 Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The text of the draft decision is the result of a series of consultations initiated a year ago at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly. In those consultations, reference was made to the fact that in 1990 there would be no draft resolution on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and that the preparatory procedure for the 1995 Conference would begin in 1992 or at the beginning of 1993, and that both the Preparatory Committee and the Conference itself would meet in New York.

Of course, this is neither the place nor the time for taking a decision on these matters. In a year there will be consultations by the States parties, but we do believe that it is opportune to state our understanding in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions listed in cluster 1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1 entitled "World Disarmament Campaign" under agenda item 61 (d).

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1 has 17 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November 1991. The sponsors of the draft resolution are as follows: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Peru, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.3, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", under agenda item 62 (a).

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.3 has 15 sponsors. It was introduced by the representative of Austria at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Austria, Brazil, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Peru, Poland and Romania.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.3 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.3 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on A/C.1/46/L.5, entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques", under agenda item 60.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5 has 2 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of

(Mr. Kheradi)

Finland at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1991. The sponsors are Argentina and Finland.

I should now like to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5.

By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.5, entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniqes", the General Assembly would note that, as a result of consultations, a majority of States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, had expressed their wish to convene the Second Review Conference of the parties to the Convention in September 1992 and that, to that end, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as depositary of the Convention, would hold consultations with the parties to the Convention with regard to questions relating to the Conference and its preparation, including the establishment of a preparatory committee for the Conference. It would further request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as might be required for the Review Conference and its preparation. It would also note that arrangements for meeting the costs of the Review Conference and its preparation were to be made by the Conference.

Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to render the necessary assistance and provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the Review Conference and its preparation would have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance

(Mr. Kheradi)

with the financial arrangements to be made by the parties to the Convention. In this regard, the Controller has stressed that all activities related to international conventions or treaties which, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken only when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): As the Foreign Minister of Costa Rica stated in the general debate in the Assembly, we attach great importance to this issue. My delegation would therefore be grateful if we could be listed among the sponsors of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The request of the representative of Costa Rica has been noted.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", under agenda item 60 (e).

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8 was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Afghanistan has also become a sponsor of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/46/L.10, entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale", listed in cluster 1 and submitted under agenda item 60 (n). I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/46/L.10 was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November 1991.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft decision have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/46/L.10 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", listed in cluster 1 and submitted under agenda item 64. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Samoa, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on resolution A/C.1/46/L.26 entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", submitted under agenda item 48. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.26 has 41 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the United States at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.26 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33 entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme", listed in cluster 1 and submitted under agenda item 61 (b). I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33 has 21 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Cuba, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nigeria, the Philippines, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Costa Rica on a point of order.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I have asked to speak to request that Costa Rica be included among the sponsors of this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement by the representative of Costa Rica will be noted.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/46/L.39 entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee", listed in cluster 1 and submitted under agenda item 60. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/46/L.39 was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991, on behalf of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Mr. Kheradi)

While I am speaking I should like to read out, on behalf of the Secretary-General, the following statement with respect to draft decision A/C.1/46/L.39 regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee.

"By the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/46/L.39 concerning the 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the General Assembly would take note of the intent of the Parties to the Treaty to form a Preparatory Committee in 1993 for the Conference and would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-seventh session the item entitled 'Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee'.

(Mr. Kheradi)

"It should be noted that the Conference would be a conference of States Parties to the Treaty. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that, as with the previous four Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty, there would be no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In this regard, the Controller has stressed that all activities related to international Conventions or Treaties which, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken only when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States Parties."

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.39 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions after a decision is taken on all draft resolutions listed in cluster 1.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33 has just been adopted without a vote. Japan considers that the United Nations fellowship programme is very important in promoting expertise in disarmament among future leaders, in particular of developing countries. At the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1982, Japan proposed to invite the participants in the programme to make a study visit to Japan, including visits to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Based on that proposal, Japan has received more than 200 participants since 1983.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

My delegation wishes to inform the Committee that this year again, as last year, Japan has been happy to welcome participants in the programme to Japan, and Japan is willing to continue to cooperate with the programme in the future.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): I should like to speak on two draft resolutions that have just been adopted without a vote: A/C.1/46/L.26, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", and A/C.1/46/L.33, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme".

As I speak in the Committee for the first time, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Korea my sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee, as well as to the other members of the Bureau on their election. I assure you of the full support and cooperation of my delegation. We wish you every success.

The Republic of Korea, as a sponsoring State, welcomes the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.26, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements". We find extremely significant the adoption of the draft resolution at this historic time of world-wide reconciliation and cooperation, which we are convinced will serve as an impetus for the members of the international community in complying with arms limitation and disarmament agreements.

The Republic of Korea wishes to draw particular attention to the important question of compliance with nuclear-related agreements by the parties involved. Taking into consideration the formidable destructive power of nuclear weapons, we cannot overemphasize that complete and sincere

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

compliance with nuclear-related agreements by all States Parties, whether nuclear-weapon States or non-nuclear-weapon States, must be ensured.

We believe that the conclusion of a safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as required under Article III of the non-proliferation Treaty, is an essential obligation to be fulfilled by all States Parties under the non-proliferation Treaty regime and is central to the effectiveness and validity of the Treaty.

In this regard, it is to our deep concern and regret that a certain country suspected of possessing significant nuclear facilities still fails to fulfil these vital obligations, and thus poses a threat to global stability and undermines the credibility of the international legal system.

My delegation greatly appreciates the ongoing international efforts aimed at the resolution of such non-compliance, with a view to encouraging strict observance of the provisions of the non-proliferation Treaty regime by the party concerned and to strengthening the integrity of the Treaty.

The delegation of the Republic of Korea also wishes to place on record its position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33, which has also just been adopted by consensus.

We believe that the United Nations disarmament, fellowship, training and advisory services programme has made great contributions to enabling a number of government officials to gain expertise in the field of disarmament. My own Government is among those that have benefited from the programme. We hope that opportunities will continue to be accorded in the future to many other countries, especially in the developing world. My Government is prepared to contribute to the successful implementation of various United Nations programmes dedicated to arms control and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions listed in cluster 2, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15, entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons", which comes under agenda item 60 (f).

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15 has 5 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Bulgaria, Canada, Nigeria, Sweden and Bolivia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution AC.1/46/L.15 was adopted.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to inform members of the Committee that owing to the ongoing consultations, action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40 will be delayed until a later stage.

At our meeting on Monday, I intend to put to the Committee for action the draft resolutions in cluster 3, with the exception of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31; in cluster 5, with the exception of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9; and in cluster 4. In cluster 4, we will take up draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.24, A/C.1/46/L.30 and A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.